arXiv:1005.0887v1 [math.AC] 6 May 2010

LOCALLY NILPOTENT MODULE DERIVATIONS AND THE FOURTEENTH PROBLEM OF HILBERT

MIKIYA TANAKA

Abstract. Given a locally nilpotent derivation on an affine algebra B over a field k of characteristic zero, we consider a finitely generated B-module M which admits a locally nilpotent module derivation δ_M (see Definition 1.1 below). Let $A = \operatorname{Ker}\delta$ and $M_0 = \operatorname{Ker}\delta_M$. We ask if M_0 is a finitely generated A-module. In general, there exist counterexamples which are closely related to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert. We also look for some sufficient conditions for finite generation.

1. introduction

Throughout this paper, we denote by k a field of characteristic zero and by B a k-algebra. We denote the set of k-derivations of B by $\operatorname{Der}_k(B)$ and the set of locally nilpotent k-derivations of B by $\operatorname{LND}_k(B)$. We recall the following definition [9].

Definition **1.1.** Let $\delta \in \operatorname{LND}_k(B)$ and let M be a B-module with a k-linear endomorphism $\delta_M : M \to M$. A pair (M, δ_M) is called a (B, δ)-module (a δ-module, for short) if the following two conditions are satisfied.

1. For any $b \in B$ and $m \in M$, $\delta_M(bm) = \delta(b)m + b\delta_M(m)$.
2. For each $m \in M$, there exists a positive integer N such that ${\delta_M}^n(m) = 0$ if $n \geq N$.

Let $A = \operatorname{Ker}\delta$. Then δ_M is an A-module endomorphism. Whenever we consider δ-modules, the derivation δ on B is fixed once for all. We call δ_M a *module derivation* (resp. *locally nilpotent module derivation*) on M if it satisfies the condition (1) (resp. both conditions (1) and (2)).

Define $\varphi_t : B \to B[t]$ and $\varphi_{t,M} : M \to M[t] = M \otimes_B B[t]$ by

$$\varphi_t(b) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!}\delta^i(b)t^i \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{t,M}(m) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!}{\delta_M}^i(m)t^i$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 13A50; secondary: 13N15.

Key words and phrases. locally nilpotent derivation, δ-module, the fourteenth problem of Hilbert.

for $b \in B$ and $m \in M$, where $B[t]$ is a polynomial ring. We call the t-degree of $\varphi_t(b)$ (resp. $\varphi_{t,M}(m)$) the δ-degree of b (resp. the δ_M-degree of m) and denote it by $\nu(b)$ (resp. $\nu_M(m)$), where we define the t-degree of zero to be $-\infty$.

If there is no fear of confusion, we simply say that M is a δ-module instead of saying that (M, δ_M) is a δ-module, and we denote δ_M, $\varphi_{t,M}$ and ν_M by δ, φ_t and ν respectively. If M is a δ-module, then $M_0 := \operatorname{Ker} \delta_M = \{m \in M \mid \delta_M(m) = 0\}$ is an A-module. We retain below the notations A, M_0 for this specific purposes. For the basic properties of δ-modules, we refer the readers to [9].

The fourteenth problem of Hilbert asks if $R = K \cap k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$ is finitely generated over k, where $k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$ is a polynomial ring and K is a subfield of $k(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ containing k. There have been constructed many counterexamples including the first one due to M. Nagata [6]. In most cases, the subring R is the invariant subalgebra of a locally nilpotent k-derivation δ on $k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$ (Roberts [8], Kojima-Miyanishi [4], Freudenburg [2], Daigle-Freudenburg [1], Kuroda [5] etc.). Hence the finite generation of R is observed ring-theoretically. In the present article, we take a slightly different approach to the problem. Namely, we consider the following problem.

Problem **1.2.** *Let B be an affine k-domain with a locally nilpotent derivation δ and let M be a finitely generated B-module with δ-module structure. Is M_0 a finitely generated A-module with the previous notations A and M_0?*

If M has torsion as a B-module, it is rather easy to construct a counterexample (Lemma 4.2) to Problem 1.2. However, if M is torsion-free as a B-module and A is a noetherian domain, then M_0 is a finitely generated A-module (Theorem 4.6). Hence if $\dim B \leq 3$, then we have the positive answer (Corollary 4.7). We also have the positive answer if M_0 is a free A-module (Lemma 4.9). Thus, when we try to construct a counterexample in the case where M is a torsion-free B-module, A has to be non-finitely generated over k and M_0 has to be non-free over A. We construct counterexamples in the free case by making use of the counterexamples to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert given by Roberts [8], Kojima-Miyanishi [4], Freudenburg [2], and Daigle-Freudenburg [1]. In such examples, we take B to be a polynomial ring and M to be the differential module $\Omega_{B/k}$ on which δ gives a natural module derivation (see §6). In the case where $\dim B \geq 5$ there exists a counterexample, but Problem 1.2 is open in the case where $\dim B = 4$. We note that there is no example obtained yet in the case $\dim B = 4$ for which A is not finitely generated over k. In order to prove the infinite generation of M_0, we need explicit forms of generators of A as a k-algebra.

If Problem 1.2 has a counterexample with a free B-module M, we can consider the symmetric tensor algebra $R = S^{\bullet}_{B}(M)$ on which the module derivation δ_M extends naturally as a locally nilpotent derivation. Then the invariant subring of R under this derivation gives rise to a counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert, where infinitely many generators of M_0 give infinitely many generators of the invariant subring of R (Lemma 4.1). With the same setting as above but without assuming that M is a counterexample to Problem 1.2, we may ask if M is a counterexample to Problem 1.2 provided $S^{\bullet}_{B}(M)$ is a counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert. The answer is negative (Theorem 5.2).

We denote by BM_0 the B-submodule of M generated by M_0. Given an integral domain B, we denote the quotient field of B by $Q(B)$. The author would like to express his indebtedness to his adviser Professor M. Miyanishi.

2. Basic properties of locally nilpotent derivations and locally nilpotent module derivations

In this section, we summarize the basic properties of locally nilpotent derivations and locally nilpotent module derivations.

Given $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$, the kernel A of δ satisfies the following properties.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$. Suppose B is an integral domain. Then we have:*

1. *A is a factorially closed subring of B, i.e., if $bb' \in A$ with nonzero $b, b' \in B$, then $b \in A$ and $b' \in A$.*
2. *The derivation δ extends uniquely to a derivation $\delta_{Q(B)}$ on $Q(B)$ and we have $Q(A) = \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta_{Q(B)}$ and $A = B \cap Q(A)$.*
3. *If $\delta(b) \in bB$ with $b \in B$, then $b \in A$.*

Define $\varphi_t : B \to B[t]$, $\varphi_{t,M} : M \to M[t]$, $\nu : B \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$, and $\nu_M : M \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ as in §1. Then these mappings have the following properties.

Lemma 2.2. *With the notations as in §1, we have:*

1. *φ_t is an A-algebra homomorphism and $\varphi_{t,M}$ is an A-module homomorphism satisfying $\varphi_{t,M}(bm) = \varphi_t(b)\varphi_{t,M}(m)$ for any $b \in B$ and $m \in M$.*

(2) *If B is an integral domain and M is a torsion-free B-module, then for any $b, b' \in B$ and $m, m' \in M$ we have:*

$$\nu(bb') = \nu(b) + \nu(b'), \quad \nu(b + b') \leq \max(\nu(b), \nu(b'))$$

$$\nu_M(bm) = \nu(b) + \nu_M(m), \quad \nu_M(m + m') \leq \max(\nu_M(m), \nu_M(m')).$$

Next we recall the definition of a slice and summarize the properties of a slice.

Definition **2.3.** Given $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$, we call an element $u \in B$ a slice if $\delta(u) = 1$.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ has a slice u. Let M be a δ-module. Then we have:*

(1) *The element u is transcendental over B, $B = A[u]$ and $M = M_0 \otimes_A B$.*

(2) *Define an A-algebra endomorphism $\varphi_{-u} : B \to B$ and an A-module endomorphism $\varphi_{-u,M} : M \to M$ by*

$$\varphi_{-u}(b) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} \delta^i(b)(-u)^i \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{-u,M}(m) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} (-u)^i \delta^i(m)$$

for $b \in B$ and $m \in M$. Then $A = \varphi_{-u}(B)$ and $M_0 = \varphi_{-u,M}(M)$. In particular, if $\{b_1, \cdots, b_r\}$ is a system of generators of the k-algebra B, then $\{\varphi_{-u}(b_1), \cdots, \varphi_{-u}(b_r)\}$ is a system of generators of the k-algebra A. If $\{m_1, \cdots, m_s\}$ is a system of generators of the B-module M, then $\{\varphi_{-u,M}(m_1), \cdots, \varphi_{-u,M}(m_s)\}$ is a system of generators of the A-module M_0.

We extend a derivation to the localization as follows.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$, M a δ-module and S a multiplicatively closed subset of A. We can define $S^{-1}\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(S^{-1}B)$ and a locally nilpotent module derivation $S^{-1}\delta_M$ on $S^{-1}M$ by*

$$S^{-1}\delta\left(\frac{b}{s}\right) = \frac{\delta(b)}{s} \quad \text{and} \quad S^{-1}\delta_M\left(\frac{m}{s}\right) = \frac{\delta_M(m)}{s}$$

for $b \in B$, $m \in M$ and $s \in S$. Then $\mathrm{Ker}\ (S^{-1}\delta) = S^{-1}(\mathrm{Ker}\ \delta)$ *and* $\mathrm{Ker}\ (S^{-1}\delta_M) = S^{-1}(\mathrm{Ker}\ \delta_M)$. *Further, $S^{-1}M$ is a $(S^{-1}B, S^{-1}\delta)$-module.*

We define δ-ideals, δ-submodules, and δ-homomorphisms, and summarize the properties concerning them.

Definition **2.6.** Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let M, N be δ-modules. An ideal I of B is called a δ-ideal if $\delta(I) \subset I$. A B-submodule L of M is called a δ-submodule of (M, δ_M) if $\delta_M(L) \subset L$. We can regard δ-ideals as δ-submodules of the δ-module B. A homomorphism of B-modules $f : M \to N$ is called a δ-homomorphism if $f\delta_M = \delta_N f$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let I be a δ-ideal. Then we have:*

1. *Every prime divisor of I is a δ-ideal.*
2. *Every isolated primary component of I is a δ-ideal.*
3. *The radical $\sqrt{I}$ is a δ-ideal.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let M, N be δ-modules. If a B-module homomorphism $f : M \to N$ is a δ-homomorphism, then* $\mathrm{Ker}\, f$ *is a δ-submodule of M and* $\mathrm{Im}\, f$ *is a δ-submodule of N.*

We can define module derivations on the tensor product of two δ-modules and on the module of B-module homomorhpisms between two δ-modules as follows.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let M, N be δ-modules. Define $\delta_{M\otimes N} : M \otimes_B N \to M \otimes_B N$ by*

$$\delta_{M\otimes N}(m \otimes n) = \delta_M(m) \otimes n + m \otimes \delta_N(n)$$

for $m \in M$ and $n \in N$, and define $\delta_{\mathrm{Hom}(M,N)} : \mathrm{Hom}_B(M, N) \to \mathrm{Hom}_B(M, N)$ by

$$\delta_{\mathrm{Hom}(M,N)}(f)(m) = \delta_N(f(m)) - f(\delta_M(m))$$

for $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_B(M, N)$ and $m \in M$. Then $\delta_{M\otimes N}$ is a locally nilpotent module derivation and $\delta_{\mathrm{Hom}(M,N)}$ is a module derivation. Further, if M is finitely generated over B, then $\delta_{\mathrm{Hom}(M,N)}$ is locally nilpotent.

3. THE CASE WHERE $B = k[x, y]$

In this section, we consider the structure of a δ-module in the case where B is a polynomial ring $k[x, y]$. Given any $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$, after a change of coordinates, we may assume that $\delta(x) = 0$ and $\delta(y) \in k[x]$ by the theorem of Rentschler [7].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $B = k[x, y]$ be a polynomial ring, $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$, M a finitely generated (B, δ)-module and M_{tor} the torsion part of M. Then there exists an element $a \in A$ such that $(M/M_{\mathrm{tor}})[a^{-1}] = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} B[a^{-1}]\overline{e_i}$ with a free basis $\{\overline{e_1}, \cdots, \overline{e_n}\}$. Suppose that $e_i \in M$ represents $\overline{e_i}$ for each i. Let $M' = Be_1 + \cdots + Be_n$. Then we have $M' \cap M_{\mathrm{tor}} = 0$ and hence $M' \oplus M_{\mathrm{tor}} \subset M$. Furthermore, $M/(M' \oplus M_{\mathrm{tor}})$ is annihilated by the power of a.*

Proof. Let u' be an element of B such that $a := \delta(u')$ is a nonzero element of A. Then $u = u'/a$ is a slice for the extension of δ on $B[a^{-1}]$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.4, (1), we have

$$B[a^{-1}] = A[a^{-1}][u], \quad M \otimes_B B[a^{-1}] = M_0 \otimes_A B[a^{-1}], \quad \text{and}$$
$$(M/M_{\mathrm{tor}})[a^{-1}] = (M/M_{\mathrm{tor}})_0[a^{-1}] \otimes_{A[a^{-1}]} A[a^{-1}][u] \ .$$

Since $(M/M_{\mathrm{tor}})_0[a^{-1}]$ is a finitely generated, torsion-free $A[a^{-1}]$-module and $A[a^{-1}]$ is a PID, it is a free $A[a^{-1}]$-module, whence $(M/M_{\mathrm{tor}})_0[a^{-1}] = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} A[a^{-1}]\overline{e}_i$ with a free basis $\{\overline{e}_1, \ldots, \overline{e}_n\}$ and $(M/M_{\mathrm{tor}})[a^{-1}] = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} B[a^{-1}]\overline{e}_i$.

Suppose that $b_1e_1 + \cdots + b_ne_n \in M_{\mathrm{tor}}$ with $b_i \in B$. Then there exists a nonzero element $b \in B$ such that $bb_1e_1 + \cdots + bb_ne_n = 0$. We have $bb_1\overline{e_1} + \cdots + bb_n\overline{e_n} = 0$. Since $\{\overline{e_1}, \cdots, \overline{e_n}\}$ is a free basis, we have $bb_i = 0$ and hence $b_i = 0$ for all i. Hence $M \cap M_{\mathrm{tor}} = 0$. The rest of the assertion is clear. □

We look at the structure of prime δ-ideals and primary δ-ideals.

Lemma 3.2. *Define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x) = 0$ and $\delta(y) = f = {p_1}^{r_1} \cdots {p_n}^{r_n}$, where each p_i is a prime element in $k[x]$. Then any nonzero prime δ-ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ satisfies one of the following:*

(1) *$\mathfrak{p} = (p)$ for a prime element $p \in k[x]$;*
(2) *$\mathfrak{p} = (p_i, g)$ for some i, where g is irreducible in $(k[x]/(p_i))[y]$.*

In particular, if $\delta(y)$ is a unit, then any nonzero prime δ-ideal is generated by a prime element in $k[x]$. Any nonzero primary δ-ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ satisfies one of the following:

(3) *$\mathfrak{q} = (p^r)$ for a prime element $p \in k[x]$ and a positive integer r;*
(4) *$\mathfrak{q} = ({p_i}^r, g^s)$ for some i and positive integers r, s, where g is irreducible in $(k[x]/(p_i))[y]$.*

In particular, if $\delta(y)$ is a unit, then any nonzero primary δ-ideal is generated by the power of a prime element in $k[x]$.

Proof. We prove only the assertion concerning a prime δ-ideal. First we consider the case where $\operatorname{ht}\mathfrak{p} = 1$. Then $\mathfrak{p} = (p)$ for some $p \in B$ and hence $\delta(p) \in (p)$. This implies that $p \in A$.

Second we consider the case where $\operatorname{ht}\mathfrak{p} = 2$. Then $\mathfrak{p}_0 := \mathfrak{p} \cap k[x]$ is a nonzero prime ideal of $k[x]$. Indeed, since $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$ and $\delta(\mathfrak{p}) \subset \mathfrak{p}$, there exists a nonzero element in $\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x]$. Hence $\mathfrak{p}_0 = (p)$ for some prime element $p \in k[x]$. The derivation δ on B induces a locally nilpotent derivation $\overline{\delta}$ on $k[x,y]/(p) = (k[x]/(p))[y]$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{p}} := \mathfrak{p}/(p)$ is a nonzero prime $\overline{\delta}$-ideal. Since $(k[x]/(p))[y]$ is a PID, we have $\overline{\mathfrak{p}} := (\overline{g})$ for some irreducible element $\overline{g}$ in $(k[x]/(p))[y]$. We show that $f \notin (p)$ leads to a contradiction. If $f \notin (p)$, then $\operatorname{Ker} \overline{\delta} = k[x]/(p)$. Since $\delta(\overline{g}) \in (\overline{g})$, we have $\overline{g} \in k[x]/(p)$. Hence $\mathfrak{p} = (p, g)$ for some $g \in k[x]$, but since p and g are mutually prime in $k[x]$, we have $(p, g) = B$, which is a contradiction. We can prove the assertion concerning a primary δ-ideal in a similar fashion noting that any primary B-ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of height 1 is of the form (q^r) for some prime element $q \in B$. Indeed, $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}} = (q)$ for some prime element $q \in B$. Since $R_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}}$ is a DVR, we have $\mathfrak{q}R_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}} = q^r R_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}}$ for some r. Hence $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}R_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}} \cap R = q^r R_{\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}} \cap R = q^r R$. □

Since every prime divisor of a δ-ideal is a δ-ideal, the above lemma implies that any radical δ-ideal I of B is of the form

$$I = (a) \cap (p_{i_1}, g_1) \cap \cdots \cap (p_{i_t}, g_t),$$

where $a \in k[x]$ is not divisible by any p_{i_j} and each g_j is irreducible in $(k[x]/(p_{i_j}))[y]$ and if $i_r = i_s$, then g_r and g_s are mutually prime in $(k[x]/(p_{i_r}))[y]$. Then we have

$$B/I \cong B/(a) \times B/(p_{i_1}, g_1) \times \cdots \times B/(p_t, g_t).$$

Note that an embedded primary component of a δ-ideal is not necessarily a δ-ideal. This is shown in the following example.

Example **3.3.** Define $\delta \in \operatorname{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x) = 0$ and $\delta(y) = x$. Then $I := (x^2, xy)$ is a δ-ideal. We have a minimal primary decomposition $I = (x) \cap (x^2, y)$, where (x) is an isolated component and (x^2, y) is an embedded component. Then (x) is a δ-ideal but (x^2, y) is not a δ-ideal. Indeed, $\delta(y) = x \notin (x^2, y)$. Note that $\sqrt{(x^2, y)} = (x, y)$ is a δ-ideal.

4. Sufficient conditions for finite generation

In this section we consider how the torsion of a finitely generated (B, δ)-module M affects the finite generation of M_0 as an A-module. We give some suffficient conditions for the finite generation of M_0.

First we look at the case where B is a polynomial ring $A[y]$ in one variable.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $B = A[y]$ be a polynomial ring over a noetherian domain A and define $\delta \in \operatorname{LND}_A(B)$ by $\delta(y) = a$, where a is a nonzero element of A. Let M be a finitely generated (B, δ)-module such that the element a has no torsion in M. Let BM_0 be the B-submodule of M generated by M_0. Then BM_0 is a direct sum $\bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} y^i M_0$ and $M_0 = BM_0/yBM_0$. Hence M_0 is a finitely generated A-module.*

Proof. We note that $A = \operatorname{Ker}\delta$. Suppose $m = m_0 + ym_1 + \cdots + y^r m_r = 0$ with $m_i \in M_0$. Then $\delta^r(m) = r! a^r m_r = 0$ and hence $m_r = 0$ by the assumption. By repeating the same argument, we obtain $m_i = 0$ for all

i. This implies that $BM_0 = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} y^i M_0$. Since B is a noetherian ring, BM_0 is a finitely generated B-module. Suppose that $n_1, \cdots, n_s \in M$ generate BM_0 as a B-module. We may assume that each n_i belongs to M_0. Then we have $M_0 = BM_0/yBM_0 = An_1 + \cdots + An_s$. □

In the above lemma, if the element a has torsion elements in M, then M_0 is not necessarily a finitely generated A-module. This is shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $B = k[x,y]$ be a polynomial ring and define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x) = 0$ and $\delta(y) = x$. Let $M = B/x^2B$. Then M is a (B,δ)-module in a natural fashion and M_0 is not a finitely generated A-module.*

Proof. We can prove $M_0 = (k + xB)/x^2B$ as follows. Suppose $\delta(f) = xf_y \in x^2B$ with $f \in B$, where f_y denotes the partial derivative of f with respect to y. Then we have $f_y \in xB$, i.e., $f = xg + a$ for some $g \in B$ and $a \in k$. Hence we have $M_0 = (k + xB)/x^2B$ which contains xy^i for all i. This implies that M_0 is not a finitely generated A-module since $A = k[x]$. □

However, there exists a finitely generated torsion (B,δ)-module M such that M_0 is a finitely generated A-module, as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $B = k[x,y]$ be a polynomial ring and define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x) = 0$ and $\delta(y) = f(x) \in k[x] = A$. Let $M = (Be_1 \oplus Be_2)/(ye_2, ye_1 + f(x)e_2, f(x)e_1)$ be a (B,δ)-module defined by $\delta(e_1) = 0$ and $\delta(e_2) = e_1$, where $Be_1 \oplus Be_2$ is a free (B,δ)-module of rank two. If we write $M = B\overline{e}_1 + B\overline{e}_2$, then we have $M = A\overline{e}_1 + A\overline{e}_2$ and $M_0 = A\overline{e}_1 + Af(x)\overline{e}_2$.*

Proof. Since $y\overline{e}_1 = -f(x)\overline{e}_2$, we have $B\overline{e}_1 \subset A\overline{e}_1 + B\overline{e}_2$. Since $y\overline{e}_2 = 0$, we have $B\overline{e}_2 \subset A\overline{e}_2$. Hence we have $M = A\overline{e}_1 + A\overline{e}_2$. Suppose that $m = a_1\overline{e}_1 + a_2\overline{e}_2 \in M_0$ with $a_i \in A$. Then $\delta(m)$ is represented by $a_2e_1 \in (ye_2, ye_1 + f(x)e_2, f(x)e_1)$. This implies that $a_2 \in f(x)A$ and hence $M_0 = Ae_1 + Af(x)e_2$. □

Arguing as in Lemma 4.1, we can prove the following.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $B = C[x,y,z]$ be a polynomial ring over a k-algebra C and define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_C(B)$ by $\delta(x) = 0$, $\delta(y) = f$ and $\delta(z) = g$, where f is a nonzero element of $C[x]$ and g is a nonzero element of $k[y]$. Let M be a finitely generated (B,δ)-module. Suppose that the element f has no torsion in M. Then M_0 is a finitely generated A-module.*

Proof. Let cy^n be the highest degree term of g. We have

$$\varphi_{-y/f}(z) = z - \frac{y}{f}\cdot g + \frac{y^2}{2f^2}\cdot g'f + \cdots + \frac{1}{(n+1)!}\cdot\left(-\frac{y}{f}\right)^{n+1}\cdot g^{(n)}f^n.$$

Note that $\delta(\varphi_{-y/f}(z)) = 0$ with δ extended naturally to $B[f^{-1}]$. The coefficient of y^{n+1} in $f\varphi_{-y/f}(z)$ is equal to

$$\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}(-1)^i\frac{n(n-1)\cdots(n-i+2)}{i!}\right\}c = -\frac{c}{n+1} \neq 0\ .$$

Thus we have $A \supset k[x, y^{n+1}+\cdots]$ and hence $B = A[z] + A[z]y + \cdots + A[z]y^n$. We claim that $BM_0 = (\bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} z^iM_0) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} z^iy^nM_0)$. Indeed since $\nu(y) = 1$ and $\nu(z) = n+1$, we have $\nu(y^iz^j) = i + (n+1)j$. For $0 \le i \le i' \le n$ and $j, j' \ge 0$ such that $(i,j) \neq (i',j')$, we have $\nu(y^iz^j) \neq \nu(y^{i'}z^{j'})$. It follows easily that $\sum_{i=0}^{r_0} z^im_{0i} + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{r_n} z^iy^nm_{ni} = 0$ with $m_{ij} \in M_0$ implies that $m_{ij} = 0$ for all i, j, where we use the assumption that the element f has no torsion in M and the fact that if $\delta^r(y^iz^j) \in A$, then $\delta^r(y^iz^j) = sf^t$ for some $s \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence we have $BM_0 = (\bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} z^iM_0) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} z^iy^nM_0)$ and $M_0 = BM_0/(y,z)BM_0$ is a finitely generated A-module. □

In the rest of this section, we consider the case where M is a torsion-free B-module.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let M be a finitely generated torsion-free (B,δ)-module. Suppose that δ is nonzero and A is an integral domain. Then there exists a free (B,δ)-module $F = Bf_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Bf_n$ with $f_i \in F_0$ and F contains M as a δ-submodule.*

Proof. Since $\delta \neq 0$, there exists a nonzero element a in $A \cap \delta(B)$ so that the derivation on $B[a^{-1}]$ induced by δ has a slice. Hence we have $M_0[a^{-1}]$ is a finitely generated $A[a^{-1}]$-module by Lemma 2.4. Since $M_0 \otimes_A Q(A)$ is a free $Q(A)$-module, there exists $c \in A$ such that $M_0[c^{-1}]$ is a finitely generated free $A[c^{-1}]$-module and the derivation on $B[c^{-1}]$ induced by δ has a slice. Then we have $M[c^{-1}] = B[c^{-1}] \otimes_{A[c^{-1}]} M_0[c^{-1}]$. Let $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ be a free basis of $M_0[c^{-1}]$. Suppose that $m_1, \cdots, m_r$ generate M as a B-module and that $m_i = c^{-n_i}\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{ij}e_j$ with non-negative integers n_i and $b_{ij} \in B$. Let $N = \max_i(n_i)$. Then we have $M \subset \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} B(e_i/c^N)$. □

In the above lemma, if the rank of F is one, then we can regard M as a δ-ideal. Indeed, if we write $F = Be$, then M is isomorphic to $I := \{b \in B \mid be \in M\}$ as a δ-module. In particular, M is a free B-module of rank one if and only if I is principal.

Next we consider the case where A is a noetherian domain. In this case, we have the positive answer to Problem 1.2.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let M be a finitely generated torsion-free (B, δ)-module. Suppose that A is a noetherian domain. Then M_0 is a finitely generated A-module.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, there exists a free (B, δ)-module $F = Bf_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Bf_n$ with $f_i \in F_0$ and F contains M as a δ-submodule. Then $F_0 = Af_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Af_n$ and it contains M_0. Since A is noetherian, we are done. ☐

As an easy consequence of the theorem we have the following.

Corollary 4.7. *Let B be an affine domain over k of dimension ≤ 3, $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and M a finitely generated torsion-free (B, δ)-module. Then M_0 is a finitely generated A-module.*

This follows from the following lemma due to Zariski [10] since $\mathrm{tr.deg}\,_k Q(A) = \mathrm{tr.deg}\,_k Q(B) - 1$ if $\delta \neq 0$.

Lemma 4.8. *Let B be an affine domain over k, K a subfield of the quotient field $Q(B)$ containing k and $A = K \cap B$. If $\mathrm{tr.deg}\,_k K \leq 2$, then A is a finitely generated k-algebra.*

We give the following sufficient condition for finite generation. The following lemma implies that in order to construct the counterexample to Problem 1.2, M_0 has to be non-free over A.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ and let M be a finitely generated (B, δ)-module. Suppose that B is noetherian and M_0 is free over A. Then M_0 is a finitely generated A-module.*

Proof. Let $\{e_i \mid i \in I\}$ be a basis of the A-module M_0. We show that $\{e_i \mid i \in I\}$ is also a basis of the B-module BM_0. Suppose that $b_1 e_{i_1} + \cdots + b_r e_{i_r} = 0$ is a non-trivial relation with $b_i \in B$. Then there exists integers n, t such that $\delta^n(b_{i_t}) \neq 0$ and $\delta^{n+1}(b_i) = 0$ for all i. Hence $\delta^n(b_1 e_{i_1} + \cdots + b_r e_{i_r}) = 0$ gives a non-trivial relation among $e_{i_1}, \cdots, e_{i_r}$ with coefficients in A. This is a contradiction. Since B is noetherian, BM_0 is a finitely generated B-module. Suppose that $m_1, \cdots, m_n$ generates BM_0 as a B-module. There exists r such that the m_i are equal to linear combinations of $e_{i_1}, \cdots, e_{i_r}$. If I is not a finite set, then there exists $s \in I$ distinct to $i_1, \cdots, i_r$. Then e_s is equal to a linear combination of $m_1, \cdots, m_n$ and hence equal to a linear combination of $e_{i_1}, \cdots, e_{i_r}$. This is a contradiction. Thus I must be a finite set. ☐

We have another sufficient condition for finite generation as follows.

Lemma 4.10. *Let* $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ *and let* M *be a* δ*-module. Suppose that* BM_0 *is a free* B*-module with a basis* $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ *such that* $e_i \in M_0$*. Then* M_0 *is a free* A*-module with a basis* $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$*.*

Proof. Take any element $m \in M_0$. Since $m \in BM_0$, we have $m = b_1e_1 + \cdots + b_ne_n$ with $b_i \in B$. Then we have

$$\varphi_t(m) = \varphi_t(b_1)e_1 + \cdots + \varphi_t(b_n)e_n.$$

Thus we have

$$0 = (b_1 - \varphi_t(b_1))e_1 + \cdots + (b_n - \varphi_t(b_n)e_n.$$

Since $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ is a free basis of the B-module BM_0, we have $b_i - \varphi_t(b_i) = 0$ for all i. This implies that $b_i \in A$ for all i and hence $m \in Ae_1 + \cdots + Ae_n$. It follows easily that M_0 is a free A-module with a basis $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$. □

5. Symmetric tensor algebra of δ-modules

We can regard module derivations on a δ-module M as homogeneous locally nilpotent derivations of degree zero on the graded ring which is the symmetric tensor algebra $R := S^\bullet_B(M)$ of M (see [9, §3]). Namely, if we write $R = \bigoplus_{i=0}^\infty R^{(i)}$ with $R^{(0)} = B$ and $R^{(1)} = M$, then any locally nilpotent module derivation on M extends uniquely to $\delta_R \in \mathrm{LND}_k(R)$ such that $\delta_R|_{R^{(0)}} = \delta$ and $\delta_R|_{R^{(1)}} = \delta_M$. Conversely, any homogeneous locally nilpotent derivation of degree zero $\delta_R \in \mathrm{LND}_k(R)$ with $\delta_R|_{R^{(0)}} = \delta$ gives a locally nilpotent module derivation on M by setting $\delta_M := \delta_R|_{R^{(1)}}$. We note that if M is a free B-module, then $S^\bullet_B(M)$ is a polynomial ring over B.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$*,* M *a* δ*-module and* $R := S^\bullet_B(M)$ *a graded ring as above. Define* $\delta_R \in \mathrm{LND}_k(R)$ *as the unique extension of* δ_M*. If* $R_0 := \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta_R$ *is a finitely generated* k*-algebra, then* A *is a finitely generated* k*-algebra and* M_0 *is a finitely generated* A*-module.*

Proof. Since $\delta_R(R^{(i)}) \subset R^{(i)}$, we may assume that a finite set of generators $\{f_{ij} \in R_0 \mid 0 \le i \le s,\ 1 \le j \le r_i\}$ of R_0 consists of homogeneous elements $f_{ij} \in R^{(i)}$. Then $\{f_{0j} \mid 1 \le j \le r_0\}$ generates A as a k-algebra and $\{f_{1j} \mid 1 \le j \le r_1\}$ generates M_0 as an A-module. □

The converse of Lemma 5.1 is false, which is shown in the following.

Theorem 5.2. *Let* $B = k[x_1, \cdots, x_n, y_1, \cdots, y_n]$ *be a polynomial ring and define* $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ *by* $\delta(x_i) = 0$ *and* $\delta(y_i) = {x_i}^2$ *for all* i*. Suppose* $n \ge 4$*. Let* $M = Be_1 \oplus Be_2$ *be a free* (B, δ)*-module with a basis* $\{e_1, e_2\}$*,* *where* δ_M *is defined by* $\delta_M(e_1) = 0$ *and* $\delta_M(e_2) = x_1x_2\cdots x_ne_1$*. Let* $R = B[e_1, e_2]$ *be a polynomial ring over* B *and let* $\delta_R \in \mathrm{LND}_k(R)$ *be the extension of* δ_M*. Then* $A := \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta$ *is finitely generated as a* k*-algebra and* $M_0 := \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta_M$ *is finitely generated as an* A*-module but* $R_0 := \mathrm{Ker}\,\delta_R$ *is not finitely generated as a* k*-algebra.*

In the above theorem, we note that Theorem 4.6 implies that $R^{(i)} \cap R_0$ is a finitely generated A-module, for $R^{(i)}$ is a finitely generated B-module and A is noetherian. To prove the above theorem, we use the criterion proved by Kuroda [5]. We need some preparations. Let $S = k[x_1, \cdots, x_m, y_1, \cdots, y_r]$ be a polynomial ring and define $D \in \mathrm{LND}_k(S)$ by $D(x_i) = 0$ for each $i = 1, \cdots, m$ and $D(y_j) = x^{\delta_j}$ for each $j = 1, \cdots, r$. Here we denote by x^a the monomial ${x_1}^{a_1} \cdots {x_m}^{a_m}$ for $a = (a_1, \cdots, a_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$. Put $\varepsilon_{i,j} = \delta_i - \delta_j$ for i, j, and for $k = 1, \cdots, m$, let $\varepsilon^k_{i,j}$ and δ^k_i be the k-th components of $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ and δ_i, respectively. Assume that $r \geq 4$, $m \geq r - 1$ and $\varepsilon^i_{i,j} > 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq r$ with $i \neq j$. We define

$$\eta = \frac{\varepsilon^1_{1,r}}{\min\{\varepsilon^1_{1,j} \mid j = 2, \cdots, r-1\}},$$

and

$$\eta_{k,i} = \eta \min\{\max\{\varepsilon^i_{1,k}, \varepsilon^i_{2,k}\}, 0\}$$

for $i = 2, \cdots, r-1$ and $k = 3, \cdots, r-1$. For each $k = 3, \cdots, r-1$, we set $L_{k,r-2}$ to be a system of linear inequalities

$$\begin{cases} u_1 + \cdots + u_{r-2} = 1 \\ u_1 \geq \eta,\ u_i \geq 0\ (i = 2, \cdots, r-2) \\ \sum_{j=1}^{r-2} \min\{\varepsilon^i_{r,1}, \varepsilon^i_{r,j+1}\} u_j + \eta_{k,i} \geq 0\ (i = 2, \cdots, r-1) \end{cases}$$

in the $r-2$ variables $u_1, \cdots, u_{r-2}$.

With these notations Kuroda states the following [5, Theorem 1.3].

Lemma 5.3. *With the above notations and assumptions, if the system* $L_{k,r-2}$ *of linear inequalities has a solution in* $\mathbb{R}^{r-2}$ *for each* $k = 3, \cdots, r-1$*, then* $\mathrm{Ker}\,D$ *is not finitely generated over* k*.*

Now we give the proof of Theorem 5.2

Proof. First we show that R_0 is not finitely generated over k. Write $x_{n+1} = e_1$ and $y_{n+1} = e_2$. Then we can apply the above lemma to

$R = k[x_1, \cdots, x_{n+1}, y_1, \cdots, y_{n+1}]$, where $r = m = n+1$,

$$\delta_j = (0, \cdots, 0, \overset{\overset{j}{\vee}}{2}, 0, \cdots, 0) \quad (j \neq n+1), \quad \delta_{n+1} = (1, \cdots, 1),$$

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \varepsilon^i_{1,k} = \begin{cases} 0 & (i \neq k) \\ -2 & (i = k) \end{cases}, \quad \varepsilon^i_{2,k} = \begin{cases} 2 & (i = 2) \\ -2 & (i = k) \\ 0 & (i \neq k, i \neq 2) \end{cases},$$

$$\eta_{k,i} = \begin{cases} -1 & (i \neq k) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad \varepsilon^i_{n+1,1} = 1, \quad \varepsilon^i_{n+1,j+1} = \begin{cases} -1 & (i = j+1) \\ 1 & (i \neq j+1) \end{cases}.$$

In this case, the system $L_{3,n-1}$ of linear inequalies can be written as follows.

$$\begin{cases} u_1 + \cdots + u_{n-1} = 1 \\ u_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}, \ u_i \geq 0 \ (i = 2, \cdots, n-1) \\ -u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_{n-1} \geq 0 \\ u_1 - u_2 + u_3 + \cdots + u_{n-1} - 1 \geq 0 \\ u_1 + u_2 - u_3 + u_4 + \cdots + u_{n-1} \geq 0 \\ \qquad \qquad \cdots\cdots \\ u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_{n-2} - u_{n-1} \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

Then $(u_1, \cdots, u_{n-1}) = (1/2, 0, 1/2, 0, \cdots, 0)$ is a solution of $L_{3,n-1}$. In a similar fashion, we obtain a solution $(1/2, 1/2, 0, \cdots, 0)$ of $L_{k,n-1}$ for $k = 4, \cdots, n$. Thus we conclude that R_0 is not finitely generated over k.

The algebra A is finitely generated over k. In fact, to prove the finite generation of A, we can employ the arguments in [4, Theorem1.2] where the hypothesis $t \geq 2$ can be easily relaxed to $t \geq 1$. The A-module M_0 is finitely generated by Theorem 4.6. $\square$

6. Differential modules

In this section, we prove that the differential module $\Omega_{B/k}$ is given naturally a (B, δ)-module structure and we give counterexamples to the Problem 1.2 and then new counterexamples to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert by making use of differential modules. We can make use of the counterexamples given by Roberts [8] in the case of dimension 7, by Kojima and Miyanishi [4] in the general case, by Freudenburg [2] in the case of dimension 6, and by Daigle and Freudenburg [1] in the case of dimension 5.

Lemma 6.1. *Let B be a C-algebra and let δ be a locally nilpotent C-derivation of B. Then the differential module $M := \Omega_{B/C}$ is a δ-module, where δ_M is defined by $\delta_M(db) = d\delta(b)$. For any $a \in A$, we have $da \in M_0$. The module derivation δ_M induces a module derivation on $N := \mathrm{Der}_C(B) = \mathrm{Hom}_B(\Omega_{B/k}, B)$ which takes δ' to $\delta\delta' - \delta'\delta$. Then $\delta \in N_0$. If B is finitely generated over C, then N is a δ-module.*

Proof. Define $\delta' \in \mathrm{LND}_C(B \otimes_C B)$ by $\delta'(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \delta(b_1) \otimes b_2 + b_1 \otimes \delta(b_2)$ and define a C-module homomorphism $\mu : B \otimes_C B \to B$ by $\mu(b_1 \otimes b_2) = b_1 b_2$ for $b_1, b_2 \in B$. Since $\mu\delta' = \delta\mu$, the ideal $I := \mathrm{Ker}\,\mu$ is a δ'-ideal. Hence if we regard $B \otimes_C B$ as a B-module by $b \cdot (b_1 \otimes b_2) = (bb_1) \otimes b_2$ for $b, b_1, b_2 \in B$, then I is a δ-module. Thus I/I^2 is a δ-module and it is isomorphic to $\Omega_{B/C}$. For $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_B(\Omega_{B/C}, B)$ and $b \in B$, we have $\delta(f)(db) = \delta(f(db)) - f(d\delta(b))$. This completes the proof. □

We construct a counterexample to Problem 1.2 as follows.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $B = k[x_1, \cdots, x_n, y_1, \cdots, y_{n+1}]$ be a polynomial ring and define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x_i) = 0$ and $\delta(y_i) = {x_i}^{t+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $\delta(y_{n+1}) = (x_1 \cdots x_n)^t$. Suppose that $n \geq 3$ and $t \geq 2$. Let $M = \Omega_{B/k}$ be the differential module with natural δ-module structure. Then M_0 is not a finitely generated A-module.*

Before proving this theorem, we give the following corollary. This will give a counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert.

Corollary 6.3. *Let $R = k[x_1, \cdots, x_n, y_1, \cdots, y_{n+1}, w_1, \cdots, w_n, z_1, \cdots, z_{n+1}]$ be a polynomial ring and define $\delta_R \in \mathrm{LND}_k(R)$ by $\delta_R(x_i) = \delta_R(w_i) = 0$ and $\delta_R(y_i) = {x_i}^{t+1}$ and $\delta_R(z_i) = (t+1){x_i}^t w_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\delta_R(y_{n+1}) = (x_1 \cdots x_n)^t$, and $\delta_R(z_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} t({x_1}^t \cdots {x_n}^t / x_i) w_i$. Suppose that $n \geq 3$ and $t \geq 2$. Then $\mathrm{Ker}\,\delta_R$ is not a finitely generated k-algebra.*

Proof. Lemma 5.1, it suffices to show that δ_R is an extension of δ_M with the notation $w_i = dx_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $z_j = dy_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n+1$. Indeed, $\delta(dx_i) = d(\delta(x_i)) = d(0) = 0$ and $\delta(dy_i) = d(\delta(y_i)) = d({x_i}^{t+1}) = (t+1){x_i}^t dx_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $\delta(dy_{n+1}) = d(\delta(y_{n+1})) = d({x_1}^t \cdots {x_n}^t) = t{x_1}^{t-1}{x_2}^t \cdots {x_n}^t dx_1 + \cdots + t{x_1}^t \cdots {x_{n-1}}^t {x_n}^{t-1} dx_n$. Hence we have the assertion. □

In the above corollary, we note that infinitely many generators of the A-module M_0 give infinitely many generators of the k-algebra R_0.

In order to prove Theorem 6.2, we need the following lemmas. The next lemma is proved by Roberts [8, Lemma 3] in the case of dimension 7 and by Kojima and Miyanishi [4, Theorem 3.1] in the general case.

Lemma 6.4. *With the notations of Theorem 6.2, A contains elements of the form*

$$x_1{y_{n+1}}^{\ell} + (\textit{terms of lower degree in } y_{n+1})$$

for each $\ell \geq 1$.

The next lemma is used to prove that A is not finitely generated over k.

Lemma 6.5. *With the notations of Theorem 6.2, if a monomial of the form ${x_1}^a{y_{n+1}}^{\ell}$ with $\ell > 0$ appears in a polynomial expression of $f \in A$ as an element of B, then $a > 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $a = 0$. Since we have

$$\delta({y_{n+1}}^{\ell}) = \ell(x_1 \cdots x_n)^t {y_{n+1}}^{\ell-1}, \tag{1}$$

there exists a monomial $g = {x_1}^{b_1} \cdots {x_n}^{b_n} {y_1}^{c_1} \cdots {y_{n+1}}^{c_{n+1}}$ with

$$(b_1, \cdots, b_n, c_1, \cdots, c_{n+1}) \neq (0, \cdots, 0, 0 \cdots, 0, l)$$

in a polynomial expression of f, and the monomial $(x_1 \cdots x_n)^t {y_{n+1}}^{l-1}$ appears in a polynomial expression of $\delta(g)$. Since $\delta(g)$ consists of terms

$${x_1}^{b_1} \cdots {x_n}^{b_n} {x_i}^{t+1} {y_1}^{c_1} \cdots {y_{n+1}}^{c_{n+1}} / y_i \tag{2}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and

$${x_1}^{b_1} \cdots {x_n}^{b_n} {x_1}^{t} \cdots {x_n}^{t} {y_1}^{c_1} \cdots {y_n}^{c_n} {y_{n+1}}^{c_{n+1}-1},$$

we must have $c_{n+1} = l - 1$ and there exists s such that $c_s = 1$ and $c_i = 0$ for all $i \neq s$, for the last term cannot cancel with $\delta(y_{n+1}^{\ell})$. By comparing the exponents of x_s in (1) and (2) for $i = s$, we have $t = t + 1 + b_s$ but this is a contradiction. □

Arguing as in the above lemma, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.6. *With the notations of Theorem 6.2, if a monomial of the form ${x_1}^a{y_{n+1}}^{\ell}dy_{n+1}$ with $\ell > 0$ appears in a polynomial expression of $m \in M_0$ as an element of R, then $a > 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $a = 0$. Since dy_{n+1} does not appear in any $\delta(dx_i)$ or any $\delta(dy_i)$, it follows from the equality

$$\begin{aligned} \delta({y_{n+1}}^{\ell} dy_{n+1}) = {} & l(x_1 \cdots x_n)^t {y_{n+1}}^{l-1} dy_{n+1} \\ & + (\text{terms not containing } dy_{n+1}) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

that there exists a monomial $v = {x_1}^{b_1} \cdots {x_n}^{b_n} {y_1}^{c_1} \cdots {y_{n+1}}^{c_{n+1}} dy_{n+1}$ with

$$(b_1, \cdots, b_n, c_1, \cdots, c_{n+1}) \neq (0, \cdots, 0, 0 \cdots, 0, l)$$

in a polynomial expression of m, and the monomial $(x_1 \cdots x_n)^t {y_{n+1}}^{l-1} dy_{n+1}$ appears in a polynomial expression of $\delta(v)$. Since a term in a polynomial expression of $\delta(v)$ containing dy_{n+1} is

$$ {x_1}^{b_1} \cdots {x_n}^{b_n} {x_i}^{t+1} {y_1}^{c_1} \cdots {y_{n+1}}^{c_{n+1}} dy_{n+1}/y_i \tag{4}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n$ or

$$ {x_1}^{b_1} \cdots {x_n}^{b_n} {x_1}^{t} \cdots {x_n}^{t} {y_1}^{c_1} \cdots {y_n}^{c_n} {y_{n+1}}^{c_{n+1}-1} dy_{n+1}, $$

we must have $c_{n+1} = l - 1$ and there exists s such that $c_s = 1$ and $c_i = 0$ for all $i \neq s$. By comparing the exponents of x_s in (3) and (4) for $i = s$, $t = t + 1 + b_s$ but this is a contradiction. □

Now we give the proof of Theorem 6.2.

Proof. Suppose that $M_0 = Am_1 + \cdots + Am_r$. There exists a sufficiently large integer q such that no monomial of the form ${x_1}^a y_{n+1}^{\ell} dy_{n+1}$ with $l \geq q$ appears in a polynomial expression of any m_i. Since $da \in M_0$ for any $a \in A$, it follows from Lemma 6.4 that M_0 contains an element of the form

$$\begin{aligned} m = (x_1 {y_{n+1}}^q + (\text{terms of lower degree in } y_{n+1}))dy_{n+1} \\ +(\text{terms not containing } dy_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then $m = a_1 m_1 + \cdots + a_r m_r$ for some $a_i \in A$. By the choice of q, those terms $a_i m_i$ which contribute to produce the term $x_1 y_{n+1}^q dy_{n+1}$ of m have the coefficient a_i containing the term $x_1^a y_{n+1}^{\ell}$ with $a > 0$. By Lemma 6.5 and Lemma 6.6 applied to a_i and m_i respectively that the coefficient of ${y_{n+1}}^{\ell} dy_{n+1}$ in m is not equal to x_1. This is a contradiction. □

We obtain the following counterexamples to Problem 1.2 by making use of the counterexamples to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert given by Freudenburg [2] and Daigle-Freudenburg [1].

Theorem 6.7. *Let $B = k[x, y, s, t, u, v]$ be a polynomial ring and define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x) = \delta(y) = 0$, $\delta(s) = x^3$, $\delta(t) = y^3 s$, $\delta(u) = y^3 t$ and $\delta(v) = x^2 y^2$. Let $M = \Omega_{B/k}$ be the module derivation with natural δ-module structure. Then M_0 is not a finitely generated A-module.*

Theorem 6.8. *Let $B = k[x, s, t, u, v]$ be a polynomial ring and define $\delta \in \mathrm{LND}_k(B)$ by $\delta(x) = 0$, $\delta(s) = x^3$, $\delta(t) = s$, $\delta(u) = t$, and $\delta(v) = x^2$. Let $M = \Omega_{B/k}$ be the module derivation with natural δ-module structure. Then M_0 is not finitely generated over A.*

We can prove the above theorems in the same fashion as Theorem 6.2 with the lemma similar to Lemma 6.4 (see [2, Lemma 2] and [3, Lemma 7.5]) and in each case $S_B^\bullet(M)$ gives the new counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert.

As we have seen above, we use the differential module $\Omega_{B/k}$ in order to construct a counterexample to Problem 1.2. Then $R := S_B^\bullet(\Omega_{B/k})$ gives a counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert. We can give the natural δ_R-module structure to the differential module $\Omega_{R/k}$, where $\delta_R \in \mathrm{LND}(R)$ is induced by δ. Then we can prove in the same fashion as above that $\Omega_{R/k}$ gives a counterexample to Problem 1.2 and $S_B^\bullet(\Omega_{R/k})$ gives a counbterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert. We can continue this process infinitely many times.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Daigle and G. Freudenburg, A Counterexample to Hilbert's Fourteenth Problem in Dimension 5, J. Algebra 221 (1999), 528-535.

[2] G. Freudenburg, A counter example to Hilbert's fourteenth problem in dimension six, Transformation Groups, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2000, 61-71.

[3] G. Freudenburg, Algebraic Theory of Locally Nilpotent Derivations, Invariant Theory and Algebraic Transformation Groups VII, Springer-Verlag, 2006.

[4] H. Kojima and M. Miyanishi, On Roberts' counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 122 (1997), 277-292.

[5] S. Kuroda, A generalization of roberts' counterexample to the fourteenth problem of Hilbert, Tohoku Math. J. 56 (2004), 501-522.

[6] M. Nagata, On the 14th Problem of Hilbert, Amer. J. Math. 81 (1959), 766-772.

[7] R. Rentschler, Opérations du groupe additif sur le plan affine, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 267 (1968), 1968, 384-387.

[8] P. Roberts, An infinitely generated symbolic blow-up in a power series ring and a new counterexample to Hilberts' fourteenth problem, J. Algebra 132 (1990), 461-473.

[9] M. Tanaka, Locally nilpotent derivations on modules, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 49-1 (2009), 131-159.

[10] O. Zariski, Interprétations algébrico-géométriques du quatorzième problème de Hilbert, Bull Sci. Math. 78 (1954), 155-168.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, KWANSEI GAKUIN UNIVERSITY, 2-1 GAKUEN, SANDA, HYOTO 669-1337, JAPAN

E-mail address: `mtanaka@kwansei.ac.jp`